

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL**PLANNING COMMITTEE**
10TH JANUARY 2012**ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
PART A		
11/0634/FULL	14	<p><u>Corrections</u> - Page 15 - There is an unfortunate typing error under paragraph 2.4, which is repeated in paragraphs 2.5 and 2.6, In each case, reference to “Rabbit Breeding Farm” should read “Rabbit Breeding Farm”.</p> <p>A further occurrence of this typing error appears at paragraph 4.3, which again should read “rabbit breeding” ...</p> <p>Page 21 – The final line of paragraph 4.8 includes a superfluous “over”. The final line should, therefore, read: “... this context and provides an enhancement to surroundings”.</p>
11/0661/FULL	28	<p><u>Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council</u> - No objection to the proposal and recommend approval</p> <p><u>Correction</u> - Page 29, Para 2.11 07/0529/FULL Erection of a replacement conservatory was Approved (not refused).</p> <p><u>Revised reasons for refusal</u></p> <p>1. The site is located within the West Midlands Green Belt. The proposed development constitutes ‘inappropriate development’ in the Green Belt through the extension of a dwelling created through the re-use and adaptation of a rural building. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated by the applicant to outweigh the harm created by reason of its inappropriateness. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy RB.5, the aims of part (ii) of Policy RB.1 and Policy GB.1 of the Adopted Local Plan, Policy D39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan and PPG2</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		2. The design of the car port is alien to and would detract from the character and appearance of the former barn which was only permitted to be converted because of its particular architectural interest. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the aims of Policies RB.5 and RB.1 of the Adopted Local Plan, and Policy CP11 of the Adopted Core Strategy.
PART B 11/0309/FULL	35	<u>Explosive Inspectorate</u> - No objection to development proceeding. <u>Correction</u> - Last sentence of paragraph 4.1 should read 'Existing buildings (including a small cafe) are also proposed to be demolished'.
11/0310/FULL	49	<u>Explosive Inspectorate</u> - No objection to development proceeding.
11/0679/FULL	66	<u>Highway Authority</u> - No Objection <u>1 Additional neighbour letter</u> - No objections whatsoever to the development, indeed we feel the two bungalows enhance the appearance of the cul-de-sac. <u>Additional information</u> has been received by the Agent clarifying the timescales involved in the development. As such the following paragraphs are corrected: 4.1 2nd Sentence. A start was made in Summer 2007 although substantial works to the bungalows were not started till March 2009. The properties were completed in 2009/2010. 4.3 ...Members will be aware that in June 2010 (i.e at least 6 months following completion of one of the bungalows and 3 years following the commencement)